

**REMARKS**

Claims 93-114 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant is canceling no claims. Claims 93, 98, 103 and 107 are amended. No new claims are added. As a result claims 93-114 are pending for examination with claims 93, 98, 103 and 107 being independent claims. No new matter is present. The application as presented is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 93, 95, 97, 98, 100 and 102-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beheshti et al. (hereinafter “Beheshti”), U.S. Patent No. 5,995,946 in view of Venkatraman et al. (hereinafter “Venkatraman”), U.S. Patent No. 6,139,177 in further view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter “Johnson”), U.S. PGPUB 2009/0164031. Applicant has amended claims 93, 98 and 103 and respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the following comments.

Beheshti is directed toward “an alarm/facility management unit... for remote, real-time monitoring of network components” (col. 1, lines 6-9). Beheshti discloses that this unit has a “microprocessor” (col. 4, line 3) and “can receive functionally specific cards” (col. 6, line 39) that “include cards for providing serial communications to the NOC, cards for providing serial port communications with external devices, cards for providing an Ethernet connection, cards for providing primary and secondary dial-up connectivity, and a primary power card for receiving input power” (col. 6, lines 41-46). Additionally, as disclosed in Beheshti, the unit includes “two environmental sensors for continuously monitoring temperature and relative humidity to determine if conditions are with pre-set thresholds” (col. 7, lines 56-59).

Venkatraman is directed toward a device including a “web page [that] enables selection of at least one control function for the device” (Abstract). With reference to FIG. 1, Venkatraman discloses a “device home page 18 [that] may include control buttons according to the HTTP protocol that enable various control functions for the device 10 to be initiated from a web client via the communication path 22” (col. 4, lines 4-8). Venkatraman also discloses that the “costs of providing screen based control mechanisms are exported away from the device and do not require an external computer to provide web access functionality to the device” (col. 2, lines 15-19).

Johnson is directed toward “improved methods and apparatus for control using field and control devices” (Abstract). With reference to FIG. 2, Johnson discloses “a control system 50” that “includes an enterprise server 52, a first thin client 54, plant server 56, a second thin client 58, a controller 60, a Java-enabled field device 62 and one or more field devices 64, coupled to one another, e.g., in the manner illustrated, by one or more networks 66, 68 (Paragraph [0042]). Johnson further discloses that native “field device 62 is a sensor actuator or other field device (Paragraph [0048]).

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully maintain their assertion that any combination including Beheshti and Venkatraman is improper for the reasons articulated in previous responses. However, even if one were to combine the references as proposed in the Office Action, the proposed combination fails to render amended claim 93 obvious. This is so because, as acknowledged in the Office Action, a proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman “fails to teach... an airflow sensor” (Page 13). Nothing in Johnson cures this infirmity because Johnson is devoid of any reference to airflow sensors. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 93 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 95 and 97 depend from independent claim 93. Therefore, dependent claims 95 and 97 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 93, as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 95 and 97 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 98, as amended, recites an “airflow sensor comprising: a first sensor exposed to airflow ambient to the rack mounted computer equipment; a second sensor shielded from the airflow; and a circuit coupled to the first sensor and the second sensor and configured to provide a signal indicative of the airflow.” Therefore, amended claim 98 is allowable for reasons similar to those articulated with regard to amended claim 93. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 98 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 100 and 102 depend from independent claim 98. Therefore, dependent claims 100 and 102 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 98, as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 100 and 102 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 103, as amended, recites an “airflow sensor comprising: a first sensor exposed to airflow ambient to the rack mounted computer equipment; a second sensor shielded from the

airflow; and a circuit coupled to the first sensor and the second sensor and configured to provide a signal indicative of the airflow.” Therefore, amended claim 103 is allowable for reasons similar to those articulated with regard to amended claim 93. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 103 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 104-106 depend from independent claim 103. Therefore, dependent claims 104-106 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 103, as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 104-106 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 107-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beheshti in view of Venkatraman in further view of Hunter et al. (hereinafter “Hunter”), U.S. Patent No. 6,363,422 in still further view of Johnson. Applicant has amended claim 107 and requests reconsideration in light of the following comments.

Hunter is directed toward a system including “[o]ne or more client devices [that] are coupled to a system server through a network link, with the network adapted to support TCP/IP packet-based data transmission protocols” (Abstract). Hunter discloses that “client devices carry out normal monitoring functions locally” (Abstract). According to Hunter, “[r]egardless of the nature of the communication interface between the client and its supported equipment, the client communicates with each apparatus using its vendor specific native language protocol” (col. 6, lines 6-9). The types of supported equipment disclosed by Hunter include “[e]nvironmental control equipment” (col. 9, line 20) and “[s]ecurity systems [that] ... may include closed circuit video monitoring systems and web-based cameras” (col. 9, lines 42-44).

As explained above, Applicants respectfully maintain their assertion that any combination including Beheshti and Venkatraman is improper for the reasons articulated in previous responses. However, even if one were to combine the references as proposed in the Office Action, the proposed combination fails to render amended claim 107 obvious. This is so because, as acknowledged in the Office Action, a proposed combination of Beheshti and Venkatraman “fails to teach... an airflow sensor” (Page 13). As discussed above, nothing in Johnson cures this infirmity because Johnson is devoid of any reference to airflow sensors.

Moreover, Hunter does not provide the missing airflow sensor because, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, Hunter does not disclose an airflow sensor. Rather Hunter discloses “environmental control equipment” that can control refrigeration units and leak

detection systems. Thus, even further removed from Hunter is the required “airflow sensor comprising: a first sensor exposed to airflow ambient to the rack mounted computer equipment; a second sensor shielded from the airflow; and a circuit coupled to the first sensor and the second sensor and configured to provide a signal indicative of the airflow.” Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 107 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 108-114 depend from independent claim 107. Therefore, dependent claims 108-114 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 107, as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 108-114 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 94, 96, 99 and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beheshti in view of Venkatraman in further view of Johnson in still further view of Hunter. Applicant has amended independent claims 93 and 98, from which claims 94, 96, 99 and 101 depend, and requests reconsideration in light of the following comments.

As discussed above, both claims 93 and 98 require an “airflow sensor comprising: a first sensor exposed to airflow ambient to the rack mounted computer equipment; a second sensor shielded from the airflow; and a circuit coupled to the first sensor and the second sensor and configured to provide a signal indicative of the airflow.” As explained above, none of the references included in the proposed combination discloses the required airflow sensor. Therefore, both claims 93 and 98 are allowable over the proposed combination of Beheshti in view of Venkatraman in further view of Johnson in still further view of Hunter.

Dependent claims 94, 96, 99 and 101 depend from independent claims 93 and 98. Therefore, dependent claims 94, 96, 99 and 101 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 93 and 98, as amended. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 94, 96, 99 and 101 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an accompanying payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762, Ref. A2000-720120.

Respectfully submitted,

*John J. Fowler et al., Applicants*

By: /Thomas J. McGinnis  
Thomas J. McGinnis, Reg. No. 58,026  
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP  
One Main Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142  
Telephone: 617-395-7000  
Facsimile: 617-395-7070